

1 ALAN J. LAZARUS (State Bar No. 129767)
2 KRISTA L. COSNER (State Bar No. 213338)
3 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
4 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
5 San Francisco, California 94105
6 Telephone: (415) 591-7500
7 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510
8 Alan.Lazarus@dbr.com
9 Krista.Cosner@dbr.com

10 Attorneys for Defendants
11 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION d/b/a
12 GLAXOSMITHKLINE and McKESSON
13 CORPORATION

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 MOHINDER KHANNA,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM
23 CORPORATION d/b/a
24 GLAXOSMITHKLINE, McKESSON
25 PHARMACY SYSTEMS, and DOES ONE
26 through FIFTEEN,

27 Defendants.

Case No. 3:08-cv-01131 MHP

**DEFENDANT SMITHKLINE
BEECHAM CORPORATION D/B/A
GLAXOSMITHKLINE'S REPLY
MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY**

Date: June 9, 2008
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Courtroom: 15
Judge: Marilyn H. Patel

28 I.

INTRODUCTION

29 Plaintiff has opposed a stay pending transfer to the Avandia® MDL, arguing that:
30 (i) the pending Motion to Remand is best considered by this Court; and (ii) a stay will
31 prejudice Plaintiff with "unnecessary delay." Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of
32 Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Stay ("Pl's Br.") at 2.

33 Plaintiff's arguments are without merit, and GSK files this brief Reply to
34 emphasize that the interests of consistency and judicial economy are best served by
35 allowing the MDL judge to decide the jurisdictional issues in this case.

II.

**THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES IN THIS CASE
SHOULD BE DECIDED BY THE MDL JUDGE**

Arguing that McKesson is a proper defendant in this case, Plaintiff urges this Court to deny GSK's Motion to Stay and to decide the pending Motion to Remand.

Plaintiff asserts that McKesson's role with respect to Avandia extended beyond distribution into marketing. Plaintiff is wrong. As GSK has made clear, McKesson did nothing more than pass along unopened bottles of Avandia to hospitals and health care providers. *See* Declaration of Greg Yonko (attached as Exhibit "A" to the Declaration of Krista L. Cosner in Support of GSK's Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Stay (hereinafter "Cosner Decl. ISO Reply"). Thus, there is no legitimate claim against McKesson, its joinder being solely to destroy diversity.

The transparency of Plaintiff's strategy is emphasized by a quick review of relevant statistics. To date, there have been 316 Avandia cases filed in the United States. McKesson *has not been named in a single case* except in some of the cases filed in California. Out of 42 total cases filed in California, 18 were filed in federal court. Twenty-four were filed in state court, and *each of these 24 named McKesson as a defendant*. Of these 24 cases, 23 (representing 135 plaintiffs) have been or are in the process of being removed to federal court.¹ Seventeen of these 23 cases have already been transferred to the MDL.² Ten of the 17 transferred cases had Motions to Remand pending when transferred.³ No Motion to Remand has been granted in any case. *See* Cosner Decl. ISO Reply, ¶¶ 1-8.

¹ The remaining California state court case, *Fabyankovic v. SmithKline Beecham et al.*, was not removed because it included two Pennsylvania plaintiffs, destroying diversity as to GSK. Cosner Decl. ISO Reply, ¶ 9.

² There are motions to remand pending in three of the six cases pending transfer to the MDL, the instant case being one of them. Cosner Decl. ISO Reply, ¶ 10.

³ Motions to remand were never filed in the other seven removed and transferred cases. Cosner Decl. ISO Reply, ¶ 11.

1 The 10 cases that have been transferred to the Avandia MDL with remand motions
 2 pending include eight cases from the Northern District of California,⁴ and two cases from
 3 the Central District of California – *Johnson v. GlaxoSmithKline, et al.*, and *Boone v.*
 4 *SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.*⁵ In its Transfer Order, the Judicial Panel on
 5 Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) explained that *Boone*, along with the eight cases from
 6 the Northern District of California, should be transferred because of the “salutary effect
 7 of placing all actions in this docket before a single judge” who can ensure a “just and
 8 expeditious resolution of the issues.” See Transfer Order, *In re Avandia Marketing, Sales*
 9 *Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1871 (“Transfer Order”) (J.P.M.L.
 10 Apr. 8, 2008) (attached as Exhibit “B” to Cosner Decl. ISO Reply).

11 For exactly the same reasons of consistency and economy, the jurisdictional
 12 questions raised by this case are best considered by the MDL judge. Plaintiff protests
 13 that this Court has the right to decide these issues; however, the fact that the Court *can*
 14 make such determinations does not mean that it *must* or that it *should*. The JPML has
 15 acknowledged that it is completely appropriate for a case to be transferred to the MDL
 16 while a remand motion is pending, and for the transferee court to decide the jurisdictional
 17 issues. See, e.g., *In re K-Dur Antitrust Litigation*, Docket No. 1419, Judicial Panel on
 18 Multidistrict Litigation, 162 F. Supp. 2d 688, 689 n.4 (2001).

19 There is no good reason for multiple federal courts to consider identical
 20 jurisdictional issues in this Avandia litigation. The prudent method of addressing these
 21 issues is to defer decision to the MDL transferee judge who can make consistent

22
 23 ⁴ The eight cases removed to the Northern District of California were *Bone, Bowles, Hall, Hefner,*
 24 *Jefferson, Fisher, Thornton and Upshaw*. All of these cases were related before this Court. As Your
 25 Honor is aware, prior to argument on the motions for remand and motions to stay, the parties entered into
 a stipulation to stay the proceedings pending the JPML’s ruling on plaintiffs’ opposition to the transfer of
 each of these matters to the Avandia MDL. Cosner Decl. ISO Reply, ¶ 12.

26 ⁵ In *Johnson*, plaintiffs failed to oppose the JPML’s conditional transfer order and the matter was
 27 transferred to the Avandia MDL with plaintiffs’ remand motion pending. In *Boone*, Judge Larson heard
 28 argument on Plaintiffs’ Motion to Remand and GSK’s Motions to Stay; however, he did not decide either.
 Rather, by declining to act on the pending motions, he allowed the case to be transferred to the MDL,
 where the still-pending Motion to Remand will be decided. Cosner Decl. ISO Reply, ¶ 13-14.

1 decisions across the body of cases already transferred and those awaiting transfer.

2 **III.**

3 **PLAINTIFF WILL NOT BE PREJUDICED BY A STAY**

4 Plaintiff alleges that he will “be prejudiced by excessive delay and cost of
5 litigating in a foreign and inconvenient forum if the case is stayed and transferred to the
6 Eastern District of Pennsylvania.” Pl’s Br. at 4. Plaintiff attributes some of this
7 “prejudice” to the assertion that “this action does not involve the same issues common to
8 the cases pending in the Avandia MDL litigation.” *Id.* To the contrary, Plaintiff’s claims
9 contain identical allegations to those raised by the other cases transferred or awaiting
10 transfer to the Avandia MDL, including (i) whether Avandia caused or substantially
11 contributed to the development of the risk of heart attack or related conditions; and (ii)
12 whether GSK knew that Avandia caused or substantially contributed to the development
13 of the risk of heart attack or related conditions, and failed to warn consumers and the
14 medical community. Moreover, Plaintiff’s “excessive delay” argument is without merit,
15 as Judge Rufe has indicated that she will be ready to address remand motions within the
16 next sixty days.

17 **IV.**

18 **CONCLUSION**

19 For the reasons set forth above and in GSK’s Memorandum in Support of its
20 Motion to Stay, GSK respectfully requests that this Court grant its motion to stay all
21 proceedings pending transfer of this case to the Avandia MDL.

22
23 Dated: May 23, 2008

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

24 /s/ Krista L. Cosner
25 KRISTA L. COSNER

26 Attorneys for Defendants
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM
27 CORPORATION d/b/a
GLAXOSMITHKLINE and McKESSON
28 CORPORATION

1 ALAN J. LAZARUS (State Bar No. 129767)
2 KRISTA L. COSNER (State Bar No. 213338)
3 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
4 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
5 San Francisco, California 94105
6 Telephone: (415) 591-7500
7 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510
8 Alan.Lazarus@dbr.com
9 Krista.Cosner@dbr.com

10 Attorneys for Defendants
11 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION d/b/a
12 GLAXOSMITHKLINE and McKESSON
13 CORPORATION

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 MOHINDER KHANNA

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM
21 CORPORATION d/b/a
22 GLAXOSMITHKLINE, McKESSON
23 PHARMACY SYSTEMS, and DOES ONE
24 through FIFTEEN, inclusive,

25 Defendants.

Case No. CV-08-1131 MHP

**DECLARATION OF KRISTA L.
COSNER IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANT SMITHKLINE
BEECHAM CORPORATION D/B/A
GLAXOSMITHKLINE'S REPLY
MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY**

Date: June 9, 2008
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Courtroom: 15
Judge: Marilyn H. Patel

26 I, KRISTA L. COSNER, declare:

27 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice before all courts of the State of
28 California and am an Associate with Drinker Biddle & Reath, LLP, attorneys for
SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION d/b/a GLAXOSMITHKLINE ("GSK")
and McKESSON CORPORATION ("McKesson") (collectively, "Defendants") in this
action. I make this Declaration based on my personal knowledge, in support of
Defendant GSK's Reply Memorandum of Law In Support of Motion to Stay. I would
and could competently testify to the matters stated in this Declaration if called as a
witness.

2. Attached as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Greg Yonko in Support of Notice of Removal and Removal by GSK.

3. To date, there have been 316 Avandia cases filed in the United States. McKesson has not been named in a single case except in some of the cases filed in California.

4. Out of 42 total cases filed in California, 18 were filed in federal court.

5. Twenty-four cases were filed in state court, and all 24 named McKesson as a defendant.

6. Of these 24 cases, 23 (representing 135 plaintiffs) have been or are in the process of being removed to federal court.

7. Seventeen of these 23 cases have already been transferred to the MDL.

8. Ten of the 17 cases had Motions to Remand pending when transferred, and no Motion to Remand has been granted.

9. The remaining California state court case, *Fabyankovic v. SmithKline Beecham et al.*, was not removed because it included two Pennsylvania plaintiffs, destroying diversity as to GSK.

10. There are motions to remand pending in three of the six cases pending transfer to the MDL, the instant case being one of them.

11. Motions to remand were never filed in the other seven removed and transferred cases.

12. The eight cases removed to the Northern District of California and related before this Court were: (1) *Bone, Dorothy, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-05886 MHP; (2) *Bowles, Richard, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-06328 MHP; (3) *Hall, James v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-05887 MHP; (4) *Hefner, Rose, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-06050 MHP; (5) *Jefferson, James v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-

1 05888 MHP; (6) *Fisher, George v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba*
 2 *GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-05889 MHP; (7) *Thornton, Hector v.*
 3 *SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et al.*, Case No. CV-07-05890
 4 MHP; (8) *Upshaw, Ivan v. SmithKline Beecham Corporation dba GlaxoSmithKline et*
 5 *al.*, Case No. CV-07-05891 MHP. Prior to argument on the motions for remand and
 6 motions to stay, the parties entered into a stipulation to stay the proceedings pending the
 7 JPML's ruling on plaintiffs' opposition to the transfer of each of these matters to the
 8 Avandia MDL.

9 13. In *Johnson v. GlaxoSmithKline, et al.*, plaintiffs failed to oppose the
 10 JPML's conditional transfer order and the matter was transferred to the Avandia MDL
 11 with plaintiffs' remand motion pending.

12 14. In *Boone v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al.*, Judge Larson heard
 13 argument on Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand and GSK's Motions to Stay; however, he did
 14 not decide either. Rather, by declining to act on the pending motions, he allowed the case
 15 to be transferred to the MDL, where the still-pending Motion to Remand will be decided.

16 15. Attached hereto at **Exhibit B** is a true and accurate copy of Transfer Order,
 17 *In re Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1871
 18 (J.P.M.L. Apr. 8, 2008).

19 ////

20 ////

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America

1 that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this 23rd day of May, 2008 in San
2 Francisco, California.

3
4 Dated: May 23, 2008

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

5 /s/ Krista L. Cosner
6 KRISTA L. COSNER

7 Attorneys for Defendants
8 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM
9 CORPORATION d/b/a
10 GLAXOSMITHKLINE and McKESSON
11 CORPORATION
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

1 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. (State Bar No. 112279)
 2 KRISTA L. COSNER (State Bar No. 213338)
 3 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
 4 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
 5 San Francisco, California 94105
 6 Telephone: (415) 591-7500
 7 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510

8 Attorneys for Defendants
 9 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION dba
 10 GLAXOSMITHKLINE and McKESSON
 11 CORPORATION

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 DOROTHY BONE; DAVID COOK;
 16 JESUS COTA; JO ELLEN GARNER;
 17 BARRON GATTA; CATHY GRAY;
 18 FRANKLIN JENKINS; GREGORY
 19 RODRIGUEZ; ROBERT RODRIGUEZ;
 20 ROGER TAVARES; LAVIOLA
 21 TOWNSEND,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM
 25 CORPORATION dba
 26 GLAXOSMITHKLINE and McKESSON
 27 CORPORATION,

28 Defendants.

Case No.

DECLARATION OF GREG YONKO IN
 SUPPORT OF NOTICE OF REMOVAL
 AND REMOVAL ACTION, UNDER 28
 U.S.C. § 1441(B) (DIVERSITY) and 28
 U.S.C. § 1441(C) (FEDERAL
 QUESTION) OF DEFENDANT
 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM
 CORPORATION dba
 GLAXOSMITHKLINE

1, GREG YONKO, declare:

1. I am Senior Vice President - Purchasing for McKesson Corporation ("McKesson"), and make this declaration in support of the Notice of Removal and Removal Action of defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline ("GSK") based on my personal knowledge.
2. I have been in my current position since 1997, and have been employed by McKesson for over 25 years. As Vice President of Purchasing, I am responsible for

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
 50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94105

SP109173041

DECLARATION OF GREG YONKO IN SUPPORT OF REMOVAL

CASE NO.

1 purchasing prescription and non-prescription branded product management and
 2 investment purchasing.

3 3. McKesson was and is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of
 4 business in San Francisco, California.

5 4. McKesson was served with the Summons and Complaint in this action on
 6 October 24, 2007.

7 5. McKesson consents to the removal of this action.

8 6. McKesson is a wholesale distributor of pharmaceuticals, over-the-counter
 9 and health and beauty products to chains, independent pharmacy customers and hospitals.
 10 As a wholesale distributor, McKesson distributes products manufactured by others. As to
 11 Avandia®, McKesson does not manufacture, produce, process, test, encapsulate, label, or
 12 package, these products, nor does it make any representations or warranties as to the
 13 product's safety or efficacy.

14 7. McKesson distributed Avandia®, manufactured by GSK, along with many
 15 other products of other pharmaceutical companies, to certain drug stores, pharmacies,
 16 health care facilities and hospitals throughout the United States. As stated above,
 17 McKesson did not manufacture, produce, process, test, encapsulate, label, or package
 18 Avandia®, but only delivered the unopened boxes that contained the drug.

19 8. McKesson is one of many suppliers who could have supplied Avandia® to
 20 the numerous pharmacies throughout the United States.

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
 22 foregoing is true and correct, and this declaration was executed on November 16, 2007 in
 23 San Francisco, California.

24 
 25 GREG YONKO

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000

EXHIBIT B

A CERTIFIED TRUE COPY

ATTEST

By Mecca Thompson on Apr 08, 2008

FOR THE UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
on
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Apr 08, 2008

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE

IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 1871

TRANSFER ORDER

Before the entire Panel*: Plaintiffs in nine actions listed on Schedule A and pending in the Central District of California (one action) and the Northern District of California (eight actions), respectively, have moved, pursuant to Rule 7.4, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001), to vacate our orders conditionally transferring the actions to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for inclusion in MDL No. 1871. Responding defendant SmithKlineBeecham Corp. d/b/a/ GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) opposes the motions.

After considering all argument of counsel, we find that these actions involve common questions of fact with actions in this litigation previously transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and that transfer of these nine actions to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for inclusion in MDL No. 1871 will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. We further find that transfer of these actions is appropriate for reasons that we set out in our original order directing centralization in this docket. In that order, we held that the Eastern District of Pennsylvania was a proper Section 1407 forum for actions arising from allegations that certain diabetes drugs manufactured by GSK – Avandia and/or two sister drugs containing Avandia (Avandamet and Avandaryl) – cause an increased risk of heart attack and other physical injury, and that GSK failed to provide adequate warnings concerning that risk. *See In re Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, 528 F.Supp.2d 1339 (J.P.M.L. 2007).

Movants argue that these actions involve unique claims concerning the marketing and promotion of Avandia in California, and focus on alleged violations of state statutory and common law. Section 1407, however, does not require a complete identity or even majority of common factual and legal issues as a prerequisite to centralization. Transfer under the statute has the salutary effect of placing all actions in this docket before a single judge who can formulate a pretrial program that: (1) allows discovery with respect to any non-common issues to proceed concurrently with discovery on common issues, *In re Joseph F. Smith Patent Litigation*, 407 F.Supp. 1403, 1404 (J.P.M.L. 1976); and (2) ensures that pretrial proceedings will be conducted in a manner leading to the just and expeditious resolution of all actions to the overall benefit of the parties.

* Judges Heyburn and Scirica took no part in the disposition of this matter.

- 2 -

Plaintiffs can present their motions for remand to state court to the transferee judge. *See, e.g., In re Ivy*, 901 F.2d 7 (2d Cir. 1990); *In re Prudential Insurance Company of America Sales Practices Litigation*, 170 F.Supp.2d 1346, 1347-48 (J.P.M.L. 2001).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, these nine actions are transferred to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Cynthia M. Rufe for inclusion in the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings occurring there in this docket.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



D. Lowell Jensen
Acting Chairman

John G. Heyburn II, Chairman*	J. Frederick Motz
Robert L. Miller, Jr.	Kathryn H. Vratil
David R. Hansen	Anthony J. Scirica*

**IN RE: AVANDIA MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 1871

SCHEDULE A

Central District of California

Leslie Boone v. GlaxoSmithKline Corp., et al., C.A. No. 2:07-7699

Northern District of California

Dorothy Bone, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5886

James Hall v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5887

James Jefferson v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5888

George Fisher v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5889

Hector Thornton v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5890

Ivan Upshaw v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-5891

Rose Hefner, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-6050

Richard Bowles, et al. v. SmithKline Beecham Corp., et al., C.A. No. 3:07-6328